

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF ARKANSAS  
EL DORADO DIVISION

JARROD LOGAN DANIELS

PLAINTIFF

v.

Civil No. 1:15-cv-01038

DAVID NORWOOD; NATHAN  
GREELEY; and JAILER JUSTIN CREECH

DEFENDANTS

**REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION OF THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

Plaintiff, Jarrod Logan Daniels, filed this *pro se* civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and (3)(2014), the Susan O. Hickey, United States District Judge, referred this case to the undersigned for the purpose of making a report and recommendation.

With his complaint, Plaintiff submitted an application to proceed *in forma pauperis* (IFP). However, the IFP application was incomplete. Specifically, Plaintiff failed to submit a certificate regarding his inmate account. An order (ECF No. 3) was entered giving the Plaintiff until June 11, 2015, to submit a complete IFP application or pay the \$400 filing fee. Plaintiff was advised that failure to respond to the order would subject this case to summary dismissal. Plaintiff did not respond to the order.

On July 28, 2015, a show cause order (ECF No. 5) was entered. Plaintiff was given until August 17, 2015, to show cause why this action should not be dismissed based on his failure to comply with the orders of this Court and his failure to prosecute this action. Plaintiff was advised that failure to respond to the show cause order **would** result in this case being summarily dismissed.

Plaintiff has not responded to the show cause order. He has not sought an extension of time

to respond. He has not communicated with the Court in anyway. No mail has been returned as undeliverable.

I therefore recommend that this case be dismissed based on Plaintiff's failure to prosecute and his failure to obey the orders of this Court. Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b).

**The Plaintiff has fourteen (14) days from receipt of the report and recommendation in which to file written objections pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). The failure to file timely objections may result in waiver of the right to appeal questions of fact. The Plaintiff is reminded that objections must be both timely and specific to trigger de novo review by the district court.**

DATED this 27th day of August 2015.

/s/ Barry A. Bryant  
HON. BARRY A. BRYANT  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE